Reply to OA of: January 26, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the drawings and claims to more particularly define the

invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. The drawings have

been amended as required by the Examiner to add the reference numeral "51" to

Figures 10 and 11 and Figure 14 has been amended. These figures are found at the

end of this paper and clearly marked "Replacement Sheet" as required thereby obviating

the objection to the drawings. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this

objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended and claims 2 and 6 have been canceled

without prejudice or disclaimer. These amendments are fully supported by the

specification, see for example the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the specification.

Applicants most respectfully submit that all the claims now present in the application are

in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are clearly patentable over the references

of record.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter has been carefully considered but

is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

Claims 2 and 6 have been canceled from the application without prejudice or

disclaimer thereby obviating this aspect of the rejection. Claims 3 and 7 have been

amended to cancel the objected to language thereby obviating the rejection of these

claims. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by

Hruska and claims 5-8 as being anticipated by Wismann each has been carefully

- 5 -

Amendment dated: April 26, 2005 Reply to OA of: January 26, 2005

considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed.Cir. 1990).

The "detachable restoration tooth" is invented to be detachable for ordinary tooth care, which in essence comprises an inner crown, permanently fixed onto an abutment tooth, and a detachable restoration tooth having an outer crown being able to be securely fitted on or freely detached from the inner crown.

Due to the detachable restoration tooth being detachable, in spite of having gaps formed between the detachable restoration tooth and certain neighboring tooth (including natural tooth, abutment tooth or dental implant), the whole food particles deposited in the gaps can be easily removed by detaching the detachable restoration tooth with outer crown from the inner crown fixed onto an abutment tooth.

Accordingly, the invention of "detachable restoration tooth" has functions including the prevention of the gingival (including the tooth meat, tooth-borne base or tooth ligaments) from bacterial contamination and further exempt the healthy natural

Amendment dated: April 26, 2005 Reply to OA of: January 26, 2005

tooth from being pulled out due to a serious result of bacterial contamination, and to protect the abutment tooth from working overload over a long period of time and prolong its service life due to properly taking a rest after the dental prostheses with outer crown being detached.

Particularly, the key feature of this invention is to provide the detachable restoration tooth further having connection portions horizontally extended from its top edge capably being used to "attach on occlusion surface" or neighboring tooth (including natural tooth, abutment tooth or dental implant).

By this key feature, the invention has the advantages including:

without subjecting the neighboring healthy natural teeth to being ground and mended as abutment tooth, or

without subjecting the neighboring abutment tooth or dental implant to being reformed,

therefore, all healthy teeth shall be undamaged and remained intact in spite of the mounting of the detachable restoration tooth of the present invention.

Moreover, the "connection portions" of detachable restoration tooth of the present invention is attached on occlusion surface of neighboring tooth, by this way the "connection portions" shall serve as a means to distribute the chewing pressure to neighboring natural teeth which is adjoining the detachable dental prostheses and to alleviate the burden loaded on the detachable restoration tooth.

As a result, the longevity of the detachable restoration tooth of the present invention is then effectively prolonged.

Further, the "connection portions" of detachable restoration tooth of the present invention shall also serve as a means to eliminate a gap that is formed between the top

Amendment dated: April 26, 2005 Reply to OA of: January 26, 2005

edge of detachable restoration tooth of the present invention and the top edge of neighboring tooth (including natural tooth, abutment tooth or dental implant) adjoining the detachable dental prostheses. The elimination of the gap has a soothing effect on chewing. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the drawings and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Richard E. Fichter

Registration No. 26,382

min all

625 Slaters Lane, 4th Fl. Alexandria, Virginia 22314 Phone: (703) 683-0500

Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd

April 26, 2005

Amendment dated: April 26, 2005 Reply to OA of: January 26, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace the drawing sheets that contain Figures 10, 11 and 13 with the amended drawing sheets marked "Replacement Sheet" and found at the end of this paper.